

1 **WO**

2  
3  
4  
5  
6 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
7 **FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**  
8

9 Marlene Ziya, ) No. CV-10-2021-PHX-DGC  
10 Plaintiff, ) **ORDER**  
11 vs. )  
12 Global Linguistic Solution, et al., )  
13 Defendants. )  
14

15 Plaintiff has filed a one-paragraph document titled Hearing Motion. Doc. 11. The  
16 document asks the court to vacate all previous orders, reinstate this case, permit the filing of  
17 an amended complaint, permit filing without fee, and allow a jury trial. *Id.*

18 The Court previously entered an order dismissing Plaintiff's complaint for lack of  
19 subject matter jurisdiction, but allowing Plaintiff to file an amended complaint by  
20 November 5, 2010. Doc. 9. The order provided guidance on the contents of any amended  
21 complaint. *Id.* When Plaintiff did not file an amended complaint by that date, the Clerk  
22 entered judgment terminating this action. Doc. 10. The Court will construe Plaintiff's most  
23 recent motion as a request for reconsideration.

24 Motions for reconsideration are disfavored and should be granted only in rare  
25 circumstances. *See Stetter v. Blackpool*, No. CV 09-1071-PHX-DGC, 2009 WL 3348522,  
26 at \*1 (D. Ariz. Oct. 15, 2009). A motion for reconsideration will be denied "absent a  
27 showing of manifest error or a showing of new facts or legal authority that could not have  
28 been brought to [the Court's] attention earlier with reasonable diligence." LRCiv 7.2(g)(1);

1 *see Carroll v. Nakatani*, 342 F.3d 934, 945 (9th Cir. 2003). Mere disagreement with an order  
 2 is an insufficient basis for reconsideration. *See Ross v. Arpaio*, No. CV 05-4177-PHX-  
 3 MHM, 2008 WL 1776502, at \*2 (D. Ariz. 2008). Nor should reconsideration be used to ask  
 4 the Court to rethink its analysis. *Id.*; *see N.W. Acceptance Corp. v. Lynnwood Equip., Inc.*,  
 5 841 F.2d 918, 925-26 (9th Cir. 1988).

6 Courts in this district have identified four circumstances where a motion for  
 7 reconsideration will be granted: (1) the moving party has discovered material differences in  
 8 fact or law from those presented to the Court at the time of its initial decision, and the party  
 9 could not previously have known of the factual or legal differences through the exercise of  
 10 reasonable diligence, (2) material factual events have occurred since the Court's initial  
 11 decision, (3) there has been a material change in the law since the Court's initial decision,  
 12 or (4) the moving party makes a convincing showing that the Court failed to consider  
 13 material facts that were presented to the Court at the time of its initial decision. *See, e.g.*,  
 14 *Motorola, Inc. v. J.B. Rodgers Mech. Contractors, Inc.*, 215 F.R.D. 581, 586 (D. Ariz. 2003).

15 Plaintiff fails to identify any basis for reconsideration. Doc. 11. The Court's previous  
 16 order was clear in requiring Plaintiff to file an amended complaint by November 5, 2010, and  
 17 providing specific guidance on how to do so. Doc. 9 at 2-3. Plaintiff failed to file an  
 18 amended complaint or follow the Court's instructions, and has provided no basis for  
 19 reconsidering the Court's previous order.

20 Because Plaintiff is proceeding pro se, however, and mentioned in her motion that she  
 21 seeks leave to amend, the Court will afford her one more opportunity to amend. Plaintiff  
 22 shall file an amended complaint on or before **December 17, 2010**. Plaintiff should consider  
 23 the directions included in the Court's previous order dated October 18, 2010 (Doc. 9) in  
 24 drafting her amended complaint.

25 **IT IS ORDERED:**

- 26 1. Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration (Doc. 11) is **denied**.
- 27 2. Plaintiff shall file an amended complaint on or before **December 17, 2010**.

